आर.डी.एस.ओ., लखनऊ में ट्रेसरों और ड्राफ्ट्समैनों के मध्य वेतनमानों में असमानता

1208. **श्री शंकर सिंह वाघेला:** क्या श्रम मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि रेलवे के लखनऊ स्थित आर० डी० एस० ओ० कार्यालय में तथा केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग में नियुक्त ट्रेसरों तथा ड्राफ्ट्समैनों के भर्ती तथा पदोन्नति के नियमों के समान होते हुए भी दोनों विभागों में उनके वेतनमानों में असमानता है ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि केन्द्रीय सहायक श्रम आयुक्त, कानपुर ने अपने दिनांक 21 जून, 1983 के पत्र क्रमांक के-8(II)82सी.ओ.एन.पी.-II के द्वारा इस मामले को पंचाट के फैसले के लिए भेजा था यदि हां, तो क्या इस मामले में कर्मचारियों को किसी निर्णय की सूचना दी गयी है, क्योंकि यह मामला गत पांच वर्षों से लम्बित है ; यदि हां, तो निर्णयों का ब्यौरा क्या है; और

(ग) यदि ऊपर भाग (ख) का उत्तर "ना" हो, तो इस मामले में कब तक निर्णय ले लिए जाने की संभावना है ?

श्रम मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री और संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री राधाकिशन मालवीय) : (क) से (ग) आर० डी० एस० ओ० इम्पलाईज एसोसिएशन, लखनऊ द्वारा इस मामले पर उठाये गए औद्योगिक विवाद पर सहायक आयुक्त (के) कानपुर द्वारा संराधन कार्रवाई की गई थी । चूंकि इस मामले में संराधन कार्यवाही असफल रही; उन्होंने अपने तारीख 23-6-82 के पत्र संख्या के-8(ii)/82 कान-ii के तहत सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत कर दी जैसे कि औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम के अधीन अपेक्षित था । उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के बाद, सरकार ने इस आधार पर मामले को न्यायनिर्णयन हेतु निर्दिष्ट न करने का निर्णय लिया क्योंकि इस मामले में विभागीय तंत्र के अधीन अभी अनेक उपाय उपलब्ध हैं । विवाद के पक्षकारों को 9-11-82 को इस निर्णय से अवगत करा दिया गया था । इसके पश्चात् एसोसिएशन ने उक्त निर्णय की पुनरीक्षा करने के लिए मंत्रालय को अभ्यावेदन भेजे । रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड) के परामर्श से इस मामले पर पुनर्विचार करने पर सरकार ने विवाद में उठाई गई मांगों को न्यायनिर्णयन हेतु निर्दिष्ट न करने का निर्णय लिया । पक्षकारों को 16-10-85 को इससे भी अवगत करा दिया गया ।

Allegations against Manager of N.C.C.F.

1209. SHRI SHANKER SINH VAGHELA:

SHRI BHAGATRAM MANHAR:

Will the Minister of FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES to be pleased to refer to reply given to Unstarred Question 1797 in Rajya Sabha on the 10th March, 1989 and state:

(a) what "Major Penalty" has been awarded to the guilty officer on the advice of Central Vigilance Commission in the matter of large-scale recruitment;

(b) whether the other charges have also been referred to Central Vigilance Commission; and

(c) if so, what is their advice on these matters; if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF THE STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI SUKH RAM): (a) On the advice of the Central Vigilance Commission, the NCCF of India Limited have initiated major penalty proceedings against the concerned officer. The proceedings are in progress with Commissioner of Departmental Enquiries of Central Vigilance Commission.

(b) and (c) NCCF of India Ltd. has informed that in the preliminary investigation of other charges no *prima facie* case has been established against this officer and therefore they were not referred to the Central Vigilance Commission.

Chit system in Punjab

1210. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is 'Chit' system in Punjab under which farmers are cheated by Commission agents of farm produce and the henchmen of such agents in farm imputs business;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof;

(c) what is Government's reaction thereto; and

(d) what is the estimated amount of the transactions in this recket?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI): (a) to (d) Information is being collected, and will be laid on the Table of the house.

Setting up of food processing units in other states

1211. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Will the Minister of FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that one of the reasons for permitting the operation of Pepsicola in Punjab is that Government felt the need for the diversification of agriculture in that State;

(b) if so, the modalities of the new agricultural product mix with reference to the State;

(c) whether any other State in the country has been identified for similar diversification; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): (a) to (d) While approving the application of M/s. Punjab Agro Industries Corporation for setting up a joint venture with Tatas and M/s. PEPSICO Inc. USA in Punjab, Government had taken into account the situation in Punjab which, amongst other factors, required the promotion of a climate for diversification of agriculture. It is expected that with the setting up of the project, such a climate for diversification will get created to some extent.

Any similar proposals from other States would be considered by the Central Government in accordance with the policy from time to time.

Loss suffered by the State farmers of India Ltd.

1212. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) what was the accumulated loss of State Farmers of India Ltd., the wholly owned by Government undertaking, upto 31.3.1988;

(b) what were its annual losses and share capital year-wise from 1.4.85 to 31.3 89; and what was the value of its total sales for each year during that period;

(c) what prevents Government from liquidising the company; and

(d) the names of the Chairman and Managing Director of the Company specifying the duration of their tenures and the qualifications they had for holding such office?